197 the Baltic languages (including Lithuanian) together with the Slavic, to a broader group, it must nevertheless be specifically stressed in this connection that Lithuanian is not a Slavic language. Whereas all Slavic peoples (Russians, Poles, Czechs, etc.) can at least make themselves understood among each other, a linguistic understanding between Slavs and Lithuanians is impossible. Concerning this, many errors are still prevalent.
• 192 They have mainly resulted from the fact that Lith-
197 uanian was earlier overlaid with Slavic words, for which, however, there were at the same time original words in Lithuanian. I am thinking here for example of words such as were still cited by Kurschat as "Lithuanian": (6)

6. Fr. Kurschat, see above, p. 53. 1/K

Pure Lithuanian

"week"	nedele	savaitē
"bell"	zvanas	varpas
"miracle"	dyvas	stebuklas
"world"	svietas	pasaulis
"consumption"	sukata	džiova
"hour"	adyna	valanda
"punish"	koroti	bausti
"sinful"	griešnas	nuodemingas, et

Although some of the pure Lithuanian words named here may be new linguistic formations (e.g. savaitē), one should not forget that these new formations in any case /15/ go back to Baltic stems. In addition there is a series of Slavic words in Lithuanian for which no genuinely Lithuanian words can be found, principally in the area of religious life as well as in the areas with which the Lithuanians became familiar through the Slavs. (7) A third group of words that are fre-

1/K [see cat. 116, p 9 --Analyst]

192
197
[113]

1/2 7. K. Buga, "Die litauisch-weissrussischen Beziehungen und ihr Alter," special number of the Zeitschrift für slawische Philologie (Leipzig, 1924), Vol. I, Nos. 1/2, pp. 26-55. Būga points out that a series of White Russian words of religious content must have found its way into the Lithuanian language even before 1387 (pp. 50 and 52). The same would apply to the terms for a number of objects with which the Lithuanians became acquainted through the trade with the White Russians even before 1200; e.g. glass, silk, market, donkey, radish, and others (p. 46).

quently looked upon as Slavic is of proto-Indo-European origin and thus equally at home in both languages. Finally, Lithuanian contains many words that passed over into the Slavic languages. A comparison of the Lithuanian language with the Slavic languages presents thus a great number of factors that have to be taken into consideration.

197 All in all we can say today that the relationship of these languages on closer observation does not prove to be as close as it appeared to [194] Schleicher. Above all, there is a strikingly small number of sibilants in Lithuanian, while the sibilants actually impose a special stamp on Slavic. [193] On the other hand, Slavic feeling for language is reflected to a large extent in the syntax and grammar of Lithuanian. Thus the Lithuanian language, exactly as Polish, puts the predicate substantive in the instrumental and puts the object in the genitive with negative verbs. Certain sibilants, e.g. the č in mačiau "I saw," are traceable for the first time around the turn of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but do not represent a borrowing from Slavic. It is interesting that the educated Russian and Pole will not admit any close relationship of Lithuanian with his own language and that, quite the contrary, he is inclined to look at the Lithuanian language as something com-

1/2 [Footnote to text on page 12, see cat. 192 or 197--Analyst] plexly foreign.

197 the Memel. In the eastern group of High Lithuanian
184 a series of dialects can also be distinguished. Dzūkijan, or Southeast Lithuanian, as well as North Lithuanian spoken in the river area of the Mūšă (north of Panevėžys) stand out as particular dialects. (8)

8. A. Senn, op. cit., pp. 5-6.

The large number of dialectal differences implies for the vocabulary and form of the language an enrichment not to be underestimated. This surprising richness in a relatively small territory /Unnumbered page with illustration--Lithuanian Landscape/ /17/ can probably be attributed primarily to the seclusion of the individual districts. This resulted from a backwardness of many centuries and a conservative adherence to inherited land. The differences of the dialects, however, are not so strong that they could destroy the unity of the language. The present literary language is based on the dialect of the South Lithuanian province of Užnemunė (earlier the gouvernement Suvalkija), which is spoken particularly on the south bank of the Memel, in other words, the southern dialect of western High Lithuanian. We thus find in standard Lithuanian the long vowels of the final syllables preserved. (9)

[113]

9. All grammatical presentations of the present Lithuanian standard language are based primarily on the work of Prof. Jablonski, who, under the name Rygiškių Jonas, is the author of: Lietuvių kalbos vadovelis (Kaunas, 1925); and Lietuvių kalbos gramatika, 2nd ed. (Kaunas-Vilna, 1922).

197 B. Antiquity and Formal Richness of the Lithuanian
192 Language

In the year 1625 the Königsberg clergyman Johannes Rhesa wrote in the preface to his Lith-

192
197 uanian Psalter: "If we observe many strange words in the Lithuanian language, it will be found that it is a mixed language, stemming from other major languages, especially Greek and Latin; a fact which becomes evident for example in the proverb of the Lithuanians: Dewas dawe dantes, Dewas dos ir dones; that is, 'If God has given teeth, he must also have given bread.' Whoever knows Greek or Latin will find that most of the words take their origin from these languages." (10)

10. Quoted on the basis of Bezzenberger, see footnote 13[1]

197 We have seen[2] that Indo-European linguistic research in its further development has not confirmed this view of the old Königsberg clergyman, although it still haunted the German press during the First World War. (11) /18/ Rather, linguistic

11. Prof. Dr. Leo Brenner, "Litauer und Preussen, Stammesbrüder der Griechen," Deutsche Tageszeitung, September 12, 1917.

research has shown us that Lithuanian, together with Greek and Latin, originated in a common primitive language--Indo-European, and that the similarities of these languages are due to this fact. That these similarities are so striking, however, finds its explanation in the unusual antiquity of the Lithuanian language, which in this regard occupies a unique position among all the Indo-European languages. Schleicher already finds it remarkable that so ancient a language still exists at all. He refers to the dual and the seven Indo-European cases in Lithuanian that at times match the Sanskrit. He stresses that Lithuanian remained almost completel free of the great sound changes which the rest of the Indo-European languages underwent, and assigns to Lithuanian a similar role in the framework of the

1 [see cat. 116, pp. 17-18 -- Analyst]
2 [see cat 116, pp. 8-13 -- Analyst]

197 174 place the original home of this primitive people in far-off Asia, but in Europe on the shore of the Baltic Sea, the ancestors of the Greeks must have emigrated to the south from their northern homeland, separating themselves from the original people either before or after the Lithuanians."

197 193 Although for the linguist it is naturally just as essential to determine in what ways Lithuanian differs from the old languages of the Latins and Greeks, it is still not without fascination to examine the great antiquity of the Lithuanian language on the basis of the existing similarities. For the declension cases of Latin and Lithuanian the example "man" (Latin vir, Lithuanian vyras) may be given:

/19/

	Latin	Lithuanian	Latin	Lithuanian
	Singular		Plural	
Nom.	vir	vyras	viri	vyrai
Gen.	viri	vyro	virorum	vyrų
Dat.	viro	vyrui	viris	vyrams
Acc.	virum	vyrą	viros	vyrus
Voc.	vir	vyre	viri	vyrai

While Latin knows for vir only an ablative with an instrumental and locative function (viro--viris), Lithuanian has at its disposal both a locative (vyre--vyruose) and an instrumental (vyru--vyrais). In addition to these cases there are in Lithuanian three more that are formed by attaching suffixes: girion "toward the forest" (giria "forest") dievopi "to God" (dievas "God"), and dieviep "with God."

197 192 Word similarities are especially striking:

"god"	deus	dievas
"tooth"	dens	dantis

197
192

"ear"	auris	ausis
"fire"	ignis	ugnis
"yoke"	iugum	jungas
"sheep"	ovis	avis
"sun"	sol	saulē

The Latin sentence viri trahite iugum is translated into modern Lithuanian vyrai traukite junga.

197 In inflection there are striking similarities with Greek and Sanskrit:

193

	Greek	Sanskrit	Lithuanian
"I am"	ἐιμί<ἐσμί	asmi	esu and esmi
"you are"	ἐσί	asi	esi
"he is"	ἐστί	asti	yra and esti

These few examples of the antiquity of Lithuanian vocabulary and morphology may suffice. A /20/ further very old element is the dual, which is still alive today in its rich forms, primarily in the Lithuanian dialects. Thus, from the circle of languages that are today silent, Lithuanian projects into our living present like a monument of ancient times. The sentence structure is ancient. Subject and predicate usually stand next to each other with no connecting element. Only rarely is the relation of the sentences to each other in pure Lithuanian style expressed by connecting words, rather it must be recognized from the meaning. Thus the sentences are strung together as in the old fairy tales or as in the Greek language before the artificial period structure was introduced. Many sentence sequences might be compared with old woodcuts. Particularly difficult, especially for Germans, is the Lithuanian case system, in which, next to the genitive, the instrumental plays a large role. The German subjunctive is often represented in Lithuanian by participial constructions. The latter are frequently used as absolute constructions (the ablative absolute of Latin and the genitive absolute of

197 Greek). Thus, for example, Lithuanian has a con-
193 struction that must be described precisely as a dative absolute.

192 Among the ancient features of Lithuanian can be listed also the diminutive forms, which are probably not used in such abundance in any other living language. They surround the language like a colorful scroll and are especially essential to the folk songs. But while, for example, High German knows today only two such diminutives, -chen and -lein, Lithuanian has at its disposal an incomparably large number, which are attached not only to substantives but also to adjectives and even verbs and adverbs. If we take for example the word "small" mažas, we find the following forms: mažalėlis, mažilėlis, maželėlis, mažutis, mažytis, mažiukas, mažulėlis, mažiulukas, mažulytis, mažutėlis, mažiulis, mažylis, mažučiukas. W. Kalwaitis counts in his Litauischer Namensschatz no less that 66 diminutive forms for the word mama "mother," among them even a fivefold diminutive /21/ mamaitužužužėlė. (14) We have an excellent

[113] 14. W. Kalwaitis, Litauischer Namensschatz (Lithuanian and German) (Tilsit, 1910), p. 24, where the following progression of diminutives from mama are given: mamaitė--mamaitužė--mamaitužužė--mamaitužužužė--mamaitužužužėlė. It might be possible that a conscientious philologist who counted all the diminutive forms of this one word might arrive at the figure 100.

article by Prof. Brender on the significance of the diminutive forms in Lithuanian. (15) Brender shows

[113] 15. F. Brender, "Die Verwendung der sogenannten Diminutive im Litauischen," Tauta ir Žodis (Kaunas, 1925), Vol. III, pp. 76-111.

here that diminution occurs primarily with such

192

words as are connected with the sphere of smallness or emotion (tenderness, humor, contempt). The emotional values of the individual diminutive forms, aside from those that have become formalized, are usually quite varied and show all degrees from tenderest love to sharpest contempt. The former we see for example in the intimate forms for mother: mamelė, mamytė, mamutė, mamaitė, mamužėlė, motulė, etc. -- which can be reproduced in English only with "dear, good, beloved, tender, sweet little mother," i.e. with a whole string of adjectives. Other diminutive forms serve for the expression of the gruesome, peculiar, or bizarre, as for example the suffixes that we find with the word "devil", velnias--velniukas, velnykštis, velniukštis. Thus, too, the meaning of varliukštis (varlė "frog") could only be reproduced by "poor little frog." Perhaps this abundance of diminutive forms with many meanings is connected with the decline of the descriptive adjective in Lithuanian, so readily employed by the German language. In the intimate forms this connection, which as far as I know has not yet been pointed out, definitely exists, for it is precisely in this sphere that we meet the greatest abundance of distinguishing suffixes. The preference [181] of the Lithuanians for diminutives permits also the inference of a certain basic mental attitude, as C. Reisig expresses it: "If a language is rich in diminutive endings, a certain national character can be recognized in this fact: there is in this something friendly and jovial." (16)

192
193
181

16. C. C. Reisig, Vorlesungen über lateinische Sprachwissenschaft (Berlin, 1881), Vol. I, p. 219. The remark quoted here agrees with the findings of W. Schmidt, who, proceeding from completely different viewpoints, in his work Sprachfamilien und Sprachenkreise der Erde ascribes on p. 464 the pushing ahead of the genitive to a naive, natural, spontaneous, warm way of thinking, while in the cooler, constructive, "logical" way of thinking the

113
192
181

genitive follows, precisely because it expresses the differentia specifica, that which is later and comes after.

194

If from the form of the language we turn briefly to the character of the sounds, we find, as a very ancient phenomenon, a peculiar, swaying rhythm. As early as the middle of the last century this was for Leopold Arends, the inventor of stenography, /22/ his reason for working with the problem of speech modulation, i.e. with the so-called singing character of speech. It belongs to the features of the Lithuanian language that are incomprehensible for the foreigner who cannot learn it. In order, therefore, to give at least some idea of its nature, I quote from Vydūnas: "The Lithuanian language has a completely individual and for the present a unique character in regard to rhythm. It moves under tension from two parallel rhythms that work against each other simultaneously. The basic rhythm is that of the alternation of long and short sounds or syllables. In addition there is the alternation between higher and lower tones. And often the high tone falls on the short vowel in opposition to the force of the long, full sound; e.g. in individual words: sūnùs "son," ùpē "river." The tone wanders, however, in the various cases of most inflected words from one syllable to another . . .But the rhythm of tone has only a secondary significance. . .The language rather moves forward swaying like a song. For that reason, too, the richness of forms has been preserved until now. A very strong accent, particularly if it had become fixed in any special place, would probably have resulted in the wearing off of endings." (17)

[113]

17. W. St. Vydūnas, Litauen in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart (Tilsit, 1916), pp. 87-88.

Present-day linguistics points out that in

814 language. To be sure, Jablonskis was primarily a
195 grammarian and not an artist. Most important to him was simple clarity. But he always appreciated and welcomed also poets and thinkers taking part in the creation of the language, and never held back with his advice. (21)

[113]

21. A brief appreciation of Jablonskis in German is given by VydÛnas: "Schöpfer der litauischen Schriftsprache," Unsere Stimme (Tilsit), Vol. 2, pp. 27-28.

195 The third problem* that had to be overcome
197 in the creation of the Lithuanian literary language, and that was perhaps the most important of all, was a question of transforming the Lithuanian language from a peasant language into an instrument with which even the educated, the artist, and the scientist would be able to work. In this connection it was first of all a matter of elaborating the vocabulary. This, then, will be considered first.

•192 If we will look at the vocabulary of the Lithuanian language, we must first of all refute the widespread notion that the language is poor in words. A peasant language may appear poor in words to a representative of Western city culture; but it never has been, absolutely speaking. In its living organism there is an enormous ramification. This is true for the Lithuanian language as for every other peasant language. The countless skills of the peasant's work, the diverse nuances of the peasant's life itself, of which the typical city person no longer has any knowledge, all bear special terms. In addition there is a second group of words and word formations that stem from the antiquity of the Lithuanian language and find no parallel in modern Western languages. Every language develops just as much from complexity to simplicity as from /27/ simplicity to complexity. We describe the former as typification and general-

*[cat. 116, pp. 25-27 -- Analyst]

ization. With the antiquity of Lithuanian, this typification has largely not yet been accomplished. Let us take for example the area of color expressions. Here the Lithuanian still knows no general color terms. He sees rather the nuances: the dress is a different gray than the horse, the cat different from the bird. Thus the Lithuanian language knows no less than five different terms for the color gray, two different terms for red, three for brown, and about five that in English can be described only as "colored", without, however, catching the particular nuance of the Lithuanian. The remaining colors already have attained their generic concept. Another example is the way the animals eat. The dog eats differently from the horse, the bird differently from the pig. For each type of eating there is a special expression that applies only to that case, but there is no standardization. These examples can be multiplied. It may be added that the number of words is considerably increased by the differences of the dialects; we may think, for example, of the terms of the Lithuanian farmhouse that have been taken over into the literary language from the dialects.

A third group of words, unknown to the Western languages, stems from the realm of a peasant way of life that is still distinguished today from that of the Western peasants and that has been expressed in special terms and turns of phrase. A fourth group is connected with the particular mental character of the Lithuanian, his faculty of perceptual observation, his feeling for language, etc.

Although this group applies as a differentiating and characteristic feature in the languages of all peoples, it seems in Lithuanian to be incomparably large. Let us take an example: rymoti. This word indicates a particular type of mostly sad meditation, in which the person concerned supports his head in his hand.

192 /28/ I give below a series of these expressions, which I encountered in a hasty thumbing of the dictionary. (22) They lie mostly in the area of

[113]

22. Niedermann, Senn, Brender, Wörterbuch der litauischen Schriftsprache (Heidelberg, 1932), Vol. 1.

man's bearing, and are especially characteristic of the terseness and conciseness of the Lithuanian language, primarily in terms for things observable through the senses:

atpēdžiui bēgti	-- to run back over the same track that one came by
atsikalti	-- to lean on something with the back
drebtelēti	-- to slap something viscious
dunksoti	-- to be indistinctly visible in the distance
gunginti	-- to go around bent over with highly raised shoulders
guoglinēti	-- to go around with the head constantly shaking
gurdelis	-- a man whose health is failing
gurinti	-- to walk with small steps in a bent-over posture
gužēti	-- to move rapidly in disorganized crowds
įkniubti	-- to concentrate on something with the head in the hands
dykinējimas	-- leisurely loitering about over a long period
saujelė	-- a handful
žiupsnis	-- as much as one can grasp with three fingers

192 From the area of the mind, too, examples could be added. Let those mentioned here be enough to refute the story of the general paucity of words in Lithuanian. Further, the psychological difference between the Lithuanian and German languages is sufficiently indicated by what is said here. As early as the year 1800 it occurred to Mielcke in the preparation of his German-Lithuanian dictionary /29/ that "the concepts in the two languages are not constructed from the same characteristics and do not cover the same ground, and moreover if a Lithuanian word expresses the meaning of a German word, the connotations of each of these words are often at the same time extremely different." (23)

[113] 23. Christian Gottlieb Mielcke, Littauisch-deutsches und Deutsch-littauisches Wörterbuch (Königsberg, 1800), Preface, p. 4.

197 195 We thus see that the Lithuanian language, as a result of the working together of the most varied factors, represents a finely organized and rich organism. But this richness lies, apart from the formal elements, in the main in the area of things perceived through the senses, of the objective. For the further development of the Lithuanian literary language the most important problem thus turned out to be its elaboration for the areas of the spiritual and intellectual, i.e. of art, science, technology, etc. This problem was insoluble as long as the Lithuanian people as a clearly defined and spiritually homobeneous mass had been cut off from the Western European development by the barrier of the Russian boundary and Russian oppression. One cannot construct a world of concepts in new words where the knowledge and understanding of the concepts themselves do not yet exist among the masses. First of all a broader educated class must be created to be the bearer of this new world of words and concepts, from which the newly gained knowledge